

NWC
Essay
90-66
archival

PUTTING THE PUZZLE TOGETHER -
A POST-1995 MILITARY STRATEGY

Sharon Mercurio

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 1990		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Putting the Puzzle Together - A Post-1955 Military Strategy				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National War College, 300 5th Avenue, Fort Lesley J McNair, Washington, DC, 20319-6000				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT see report					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 12	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

"But beyond thus affirming our values our policy and actions must be such as to foster a fundamental change in the nature of the Soviet system, a change toward which the frustration of the design is the first and perhaps the most important step. Clearly it will not only be less costly but more effective if this change occurs to a maximum extent as a result of internal forces in the Soviet Union."

Forty years ago the drafters of NSC 68 recognized in their objectives the importance of internal Soviet transformation and the necessity of U.S. policies congruent with this objective. Whether by luck or design, we have influenced the course of Soviet history through two opposite but harmonious policies - unflagging military strength and Carter's successful insertion of human rights concerns into our foreign policy. It is a matter of opinion whether the one or the other has been more important in influencing the peoples and leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries. What is clear is that historic change envisioned in NSC 68 has occurred. Our challenge is to formulate policies to deal with a new world where the guiding premise of east/west conflict is largely absent.

NEW THREATS - NEW OBJECTIVES - NEW CONSTRAINTS FOR ALL

Assuming a Soviet Union which continues to follow Gorbachev's declared policies, what should our political objectives be?

- Clearly of most immediate concern is peaceful transition in Europe linked to the creation of a broader Euro security system.

- Stability and expansion of the world trading system and U.S. economic welfare will emerge as the number one future

political objective.

- Our traditional interest in access to middle east oil will remain.

- Non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons will move up the ladder of objectives.

- Environmental maintenance will require serious attention.

- Engaging emerging developing countries in global issues and on their promotion of regional stability will be necessary to minimize conflict.

These political objectives are driven by new threats:

- the instability of change and reemerging ethnicity particularly in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union

- the threat of a disintegrating NATO and the need to build a more inclusive system

- the possible collapse of a trading system threatened with excessive debt, isolationism, mercantilism, commercial warfare

- emerging nations desire for membership in the big leagues based partially on membership in the nuclear club and the need to channel their efforts into more productive areas

- environmental decay beyond reversal from deforestation, desertification, global warming, acid rain and overpopulation

- the pushing and shoving inherent in the emergence of such regional powers as India, Brazil, South Africa, China

Clearly, we are verging on a world of unprecedented complexity where the greatest constraint will be the vision and leadership capacity of the major players. Creation of new institutions and maintaining the balance between them and in our bilateral relations

will require a sophistication which we have shown only sporadically in the past.

Being a prime player in this future will also require a citizenry able to compete in a sophisticated marketplace. This leads to the other major constraint - resources. Although the military burden will be much lighter, equipping the other players and getting into the game will be costly.

For the last 40 years we have shared similar security objectives with our allies. The overriding concern of the Soviet threat has made NATO a viable alliance under U.S. leadership. Perceived absence of that threat will create growing European domestic pressures to greatly reduce U.S. forces in Europe and reduce military forces overall to cash in the peace dividend. Our allies will not be anxious to pick up the bill for meeting Europe's basic security requirements as we rethink our priorities. Nor will they necessarily want to pick up the cost of increased security presence in other parts of the world. European attention will focus on 1992 and beyond with political objectives centered on integration and its invariable problems.

Our historic adversary's primary objective will be survival of the Soviet Union which will consume all its energy.

- Soviet leaders will be racing to save the country from economic collapse and to initiate internal improvements while keeping republics within the Union.

- They will focus inward, abandoning costly third world clients.

- They will seek to reduce the NATO threat through arms

control agreements and their own expenditures through unilateral military reductions.

- Through these efforts they will strive to entice western aid - a necessity if they are to achieve their objectives.

CENTERS OF GRAVITY

"The idea of freedom is...peculiarly and intolerably subversive to the idea of slavery." NSC drafters put their finger on the achilles heel of every totalitarian state and the opposite strength of the United States. This freedom has been the engine behind the technological breakthroughs, economic strength and societal example which have made Soviet competition in any but military fields impossible. This does not mean that the Soviets are lacking in peculiar strengths. The people of the Soviet Union have demonstrated their ability to endure incredible hardships to protect their country and would likely coalesce again in the face of an outside threat. Their military apparatus is still second only to ours and will likely improve somewhat in quality even as its size is reduced.

The center of gravity of other potential enemies is less likely to be military strength and more likely to be the will of the people in an extended conflict between traditional enemies or the hegemonic interests of particular governments in a limited war.

A major task of the United States in the next decade will be to maintain Nato as a cohesive entity until broader security arrangements are in place. Our allies attitudes toward the alliance range from British panic that it will disintegrate to

French proposals to move briskly on to the inclusive CSCE context with a security arm. Shaping alliance objectives will require leadership of the highest order and will include a much larger say for European members and a European commander in chief. Its military objective should evolve from deterrence of a Soviet attack to deterring conflict among traditional European antagonists and a greater out of area responsibility.

WHERE DOES THE MILITARY FIT?

The U.S. military's role in this future will be both smaller and more complex:

- Army forces will be necessary to achieve a peaceful transition in Europe and promote regional stability in other regions. The army will become a much smaller force with overseas basing in Europe and South Korea. On reserve in the United States will be troops ready to deploy as part of international peacekeeping forces with both combat and policing skills.

- The Navy will contribute to multiple political objectives through protecting the SLOCs, providing a reassuring strategic capability to Europe, ensuring access to Middle East oil and promoting regional stability both through naval presence and as a platform for Marine intervention.

The navy's force projection capability will remain but at a reduced level with a carrier battle group present in the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Mediterranean. Emphasis should be placed on smaller vessels and frequent calls at ports throughout the developing world. The main non CONUS base - Hawaii - should be supplemented with facilities on Okinawa. Smaller submarines with

improved accuracy missile launching capability should be developed. The Japanese contribution should be patrol and defense of waters north of Okinawa.

- The Air Force will meet strategic concerns in Europe and will assist in international promotion of regional stability. It will provide the insurance policy against a future strategic threat from the Soviet Union or others through its reduced force of long range bombers and management of remaining land based missiles. Air R & D must continue but actual modernization should proceed only so far as we perceive our force inadequate to meet a real threat. The likely location of future conflicts argues for greater reliance on helicopter as opposed to jet fighter tactical air. Military air lift should be restructured to reflect better the nature of the future threat i.e., more C-17 short landing type capability.

- The Marine Corps' ability to intervene will promote stability of the world trading system, continue unfettered access to Middle East oil and promote regional stability. Their size and mission will change least. They will remain the force most likely to be used in low intensity conflict situations where vital U.S. security interests are involved. Marines should be trained and equipped appropriately for that mission including the JV-22 aircraft. Marine forward basing in Okinawa should continue.

TOMORROW'S WAR....

Tomorrow's most probable wars will be nasty ethnic conflicts or abrasions caused by the growing pains of newly emerging regional hegemons. State and group terrorism will continue as a tactic. Minimizing violence between the parties may require a prolonged

multilateral peacekeeping presence. We must also be prepared, however, for swift strikes using overwhelming force and for more limited surgical intervention. It is unlikely that we will be forced to fight another World War II.

Our priorities for deploying our forces should be:

- Europe: It is vital that we maintain a U.S. presence for political and military objectives in order to maintain alliance solidarity, promote stability and provide insurance against any remaining Soviet threat. Although arms control agreements will largely shape our future presence, we should aim at maintaining a force of 50,000 in central Europe, bomber bases in the U.K. and a carrier battle group and submarines in the North Atlantic.

- Maintaining SLOCs: So long as the Middle East remains unstable we should maintain a carrier battle group in the Mediterranean. Frequent port calls by marine carrying frigates should be our aim in Latin America, Africa and South East Asia.

- The Pacific: Our third priority and regional focus should be the Pacific where we will employ a carrier battle group, maintain reduced army presence in Korea and a Navy/Marine/Air Force presence in Okinawa.

In order to address these threats the U.S. must develop highly mobile, lighter ground forces with a strong reserve backup. Not only will these units be equipped differently, they will require different skills of their members. As their likely method of employment may well be in conjunction with forces from other nations in peacekeeping as well as conflict situations, tomorrow's soldier will need cultural, language and policing skills.

As has been the case with the Soviet Union, U.S. technical superiority can play a major role in deterring tomorrow's potential troublemakers. We should focus efforts on conventional weapons for the LIC environment, even stealthier submarines and on getting more capability out of the smaller ships that will constitute the bulk of our naval forces.

...WILL WE BE ABLE TO FIGHT IT?

Although tomorrow's security needs will be less costly, developing a rational force in conjunction with our allies will require difficult to achieve political consensus. Some areas of the country will be hard hit as plants and bases close. Services may try to preserve outmoded roles and missions. Operational difficulties will multiply as forces are required to operate in widely varying climates and terrains and in conjunction with other nationalities. Getting there will not be half the fun.

Given the difficulties in radical restructuring, we may opt to continue with the present force structure - somewhat modified - in the hope of being prepared for every possible contingency. Across the board proportional cuts are the easy way out but make no sense in terms of preparation for the most probable conflicts.

Once equipped, reaching agreement on where and how to intervene will pose major obstacles. Our own political consensus on national interests served by U.S. intervention must be considered for both unilateral and multilateral involvement.

Once the political and other obstacles to involvement are overcome we will most likely find ourselves in a third world environment with all the logistic and other difficulties inherent

in fighting an engagement. It is hard to imagine the circumstances under which we would employ large scale ground forces in such an environment. An adversary capable of sustaining prolonged combat with U.S. or multinational ground forces would require backing by a wealthy, technologically advanced country capable of sustaining costs which would include international economic isolation. With a decline in global ideological confrontation, such support will become less likely.

As always, the aim of our military strategy should be to deter. Should we need to employ our forces in the future the benefits will be in eliminating threats to our national interests as elaborated in our political objectives. The sure costs of employment will be in use of resources and loss of life. The cost of maintaining a defense industrial base capable of a remobilization effort will also have to be considered.

Unless we have taken into account the will of the people prior to employment, there will be political costs as well. Avoiding involvement in prolonged conflicts will be important to minimizing the political costs. An enemy trying to defeat our military strategy would do well to attempt to involve us in a drawn out, high casualty conflict.

Our insurance policy against misjudging the threat must be a significant increase in intelligence capabilities - both humint and technical means. Soviet actions prior to 1995 will provide the assurance we need in order to restructure. Post 1995, intelligence capabilities will signal changes in mobilization, capabilities and intent.

There is always the possibility of attack by a weak Soviet Union. We must maintain our strategic capability to deter and the NATO treaty and structure to reconstitute our forces in Europe if necessary.

It is also possible that our European allies will not have the will to participate in a broad security system or that they may veto multinational force participation in areas we consider vital. After exhausting our diplomatic tools, we may have to intervene unilaterally if we conceive it in our national interest.

A military strategy based largely on short term multinational intervention, peacekeeping, presence and increased technological advantage should be affordable and therefore more congruent with our political and military objectives than is our current strategy with our inability to meet its requirements despite the unprecedented peacetime buildup of the 80's.

OTHER TOOLS FOR TAMING THE FUTURE

"It is clear that our long-range objectives require a strengthened United Nations, or a successor organization, to which the world can look for the maintenance of peace and order in a system based on freedom and justice."

The Soviet threat necessitated the disproportionate use of the military statecraft tool. With its waning and the emergence of other national security concerns, additional tools of statecraft will take on increased importance. High on the list will be multilateral diplomacy.

Changes in superpower relations have had effects even in the

halls of the much maligned United Nations. An organization which, until a year ago, had been dismissed as irrelevant may be on the verge of playing the role foreseen for it when NSC 68 was drafted. The Non-aligned Movement which, together with the Soviet block has stymied western initiatives, is showing signs of fragmenting as NAM states realize that they have little in common and have lost the leverage they once enjoyed in playing off the superpowers. With recent UN successes and these new attitudes, there is talk of using the UN for "preventive diplomacy" before the fighting starts. The next step may well be future employment of UN intervention forces.

Key to future peace will be involvement of emerging and developed country economies in a web of trading relationships. We may not be able to eliminate rogue states such as Libya but it is entirely possible that aggressive tendencies of emerging hegemonies can be kept under control by their desire to participate in the world economy.

Our leaders, and we ourselves, no longer have the dark, cozy cave of containment to hibernate in. NSC 68 recognized that the world is dynamic. Its drafters had the courage to assess and plan for the future. Their vision has been achieved and a new puzzle lies before today's policy makers.

"The seeds of conflicts will inevitably exist or will come into being. To acknowledge this is only to acknowledge the impossibility of a final solution. Not to acknowledge it can be fatally dangerous in a world in which there are no final solutions."